

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-55 remain pending in the application.

The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider earlier rejections in light of the following remarks. No new issues are raised nor is further search required as a result of the changes made herein. Entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 1-13, 23-29 and 36 over Aether**

In the Office Action, claims 1-13, 23 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Aether Technologies publication "Enterprise Data Wireless Center" ("Aether Confidential Reference"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner cites the Aether Confidential Reference as being a single reference. However, there are in fact two documents within the Examiner's Aether Confidential Reference. The first document of the Examiner's Aether Confidential Reference is Enterprise Data Wireless Center, A Complete Methodology to Enable Your Wireless Data Solution, pages 1-15, dated February 1999. The second document of the Examiner Aether Confidential Reference is AIM.net Architecture Version 1.1, pages 1-75, dated April 12, 1999. As the Examiner can see, these two document were produced within different months.

The Examiner rejection is based on the AIM.net Architecture Version 1.1 document. As the Examiner requested, the Applicants are submitting herein an Affidavit supporting the Applicants' previous contention that the AIM.net Architecture Version 1.1 document was **not** intended for distribution outside of Aether (as supported by the statement on page 6 of the document itself).

Thus, the AIM.net Architecture Version 1.1 document was not "published" for public disclosure and does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Because this rejection is not based on prior art, it cannot properly stand. The Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1-39 be withdrawn.

**Claims 14-22 and 30-35 over Aether in view of Archer**

In the Office Action, claims 14-22 and 30-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over the Aether Confidential Reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,683,870 to Archer ("Archer"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As discussed above, the AIM.net Architecture Version 1.1 document does not qualify as prior art.

Since the rejection of claims 14-22 and 30-35 cannot stand on Archer alone, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 14-22 and 30-35 be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC



William H. Bollman  
Reg. No.: 36,457  
Tel. (202) 261-1020  
Fax. (202) 887-0336

2000 M Street, N.W. 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington D.C. 20036-3307  
WHB/df